

Collective bargaining in this country works very well. The public, through their government, should intervene only in a crisis. We now have reached a crisis in the well-being of our national pastime.

# INTRODUCTION OF THE REGULATORY SUNSET ACT OF 1995

**HON. JIM CHAPMAN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the Regulatory Sunset Act of 1995. This legislation, which I first introduced in the 103d Congress, will put a framework in place to curb the excessive costs of both current and future federal regulations. The concept is simple.

Regulations which are obsolete, inconsistent, duplicative, or impede competition will be abolished or modified. Not only will future regulations, which cause an unnecessary burden be affected, but the thousands of existing regulations would be placed under intense review and scrutiny by the Regulatory Sunset Act of 1995. As the 104th Congress begins the process of reviewing the Federal regulatory system, it is important that this combined focus not be forgotten.

This issue of Federal regulatory reform has not been born overnight. Since 1978, each administration has tried to curtail the impact of Federal regulations. Unfortunately, these attempts have not made much of a difference as total regulatory costs exceed \$500 billion annually. This burden on the American taxpayer must be reduced, and the only way to effectively do that is to take a serious look at existing regulations.

I believe my legislation achieves the goal of reducing excessive existing regulations, while ensuring future regulations are not overburdensome. The Regulatory Sunset Act of 1995 will mandate the automatic termination of agency regulations that do not measure up to criteria outlined in the bill. All existing regulations will sunset in 7 years unless reauthorized and new regulations promulgated after enactment of this bill will be subject to a three year sunset unless reauthorized. Once a regulation has been reauthorized, it will be subject to continuous review every 7 years thereafter.

The bill also establishes a Regulatory Sunset Commission that will review agency recommendations on regulations and has the final authority over whether regulations should be continued, terminated, or modified. If the Commission recommends modification of a regulation, it provides time for agencies to make appropriate modifications so the regulation can then be continued.

While certain Federal regulations are necessary to meet statutory requirements and protect the environment and health and safety of individuals, excessive regulatory burdens have impacted our ability to ensure an expanding economy. It is past time to address regulations that have unintended adverse impacts. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Regulatory Sunset Act of 1995 and join me in taking a new approach to reforming our regulatory program.

## "POVERTY'S TRAP"

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I agree with your statement before the House that today is an historic day. In the elections of 1992 and 1994, Americans gave their elected leaders a clear signal that they expect the Federal Government to do a better job in spending the Nation's treasure and tending to the needs of its citizens.

As we continue the debate begun by President Clinton, Vice President GORE, and the 103d Congress to reform the operations of the Federal Government, I believe it is important that we not lose track of needs of ordinary Americans. People who must live with the fears and anxieties created by job insecurity, global competition, and rapid technological change clearly feel caught in the middle of these forces. Their faith in Government to help solve these problems is badly shaken.

Two years ago, the President and Congress began a process of deep budget cuts and Government reorganization. Contrary to assertions made about failure, the 103d Congress put forth a \$500 billion deficit reduction plan which has more than met its target—it is now estimated that the 1993 deficit reduction plan will result in close to \$700 billion in savings. Congress achieved true reductions in Government spending in a manner which lessened the deficit, reduced interest rates, and allowed capital expansion and vigorous economic growth—while containing growth-killing inflation.

What does this mean for middle Americans? Employment levels are at their highest in years. In fact, between January, 1993 and September, 1994, more jobs were created than in the previous 4 years combined. Lower interest payments on the Federal debt meant banks could make loans to small businesses and families at lower rates. Millions of homeowners were able to save thousands of dollars on their home mortgages. Retail sales were up more than four times as compared to the previous 4-year period. By all indications, the 1993 deficit reduction plan continues to give direct benefits to American families.

As the 104th Congress begins its debate to further reduce the deficit and make Government services more effective, it is crucial that the changes adopted by this Congress help those Americans who are still trying to catch up from the excesses of the failed supply-side economic strategies. Mr. Speaker, I commend to your attention to an editorial published earlier this week in the Detroit Free Press, which very succinctly lays out my belief that Congress must fight to protect the interests of our Nation's working families. As this debate about our future begins, let us not forget them.

[From the Detroit Free Press, Jan. 2, 1995]

POVERTY'S TRAP—THE POOR STILL GET  
POORER, EVEN IN A HEALTHY ECONOMY

When Michigan's unemployment rate is at an unprecedented low, why are so many people in our state still poor?

By 1988, as the supply-side Reagan administration drew to a close, some observers were fretting that the share of national income held by the poorest fifth of U.S. households had dropped to 4.6 percent. But that

figure has declined even further, to just 3.6 percent by 1993.

Meanwhile, the richest 20 percent of U.S. households now control nearly half the nation's income, the highest percentage recorded since this statistic has been kept. The numbers also show a deterioration in the proportion of wealth held by people in and around the middle.

Some analysts argue that this divergence reflects an educated, well-paid elite pulling ahead of the rest of American society. But the statistics also may suggest how many jobs are not what they used to be: More jobs are part-time, or temporary, or full-time but without benefits. Even solid jobs can vanish in the blink of an eye; ask your neighbors who work at Kmart and Perry headquarters about that.

Michigan has had plenty of experience with what happens when factory jobs dwindle and corporations downsize. The next job is rarely as good. So it's not surprising that our cities, where these trends come together, are especially afflicted by poverty and the maldistribution of income.

Among the nation's 10 biggest cities, Detroit ranked second only to New York in disparity of income between rich and poor, according to an analysis of 1990 Census figures recently prepared for the New York Times. Detroit's top fifth of earners had the lowest average income among their counterparts in the largest cities. And Detroit's poorest group was an even more distant also-ran in its category.

We dare not underestimate the economic difficulties facing urban residents and people who struggle everywhere else in Michigan. Good jobs may not be where they live. It may take a succession of jobs, or a combination of jobs, to sustain a family. And job loss can hit anywhere, anytime.

A booming overall economy may be a necessary condition for reducing poverty. But as too many Michiganders know, it is not by itself a sufficient condition. Elected officials, and the people who put them in office, ought not forget that.

# INTRODUCTION OF THE GUN BAN REPEAL ACT OF 1995

**HON. JIM CHAPMAN**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, January 4, 1995*

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing—along with 21 original cosponsors—the Gun Ban Repeal Act of 1995. I encourage Members to join us in cosponsoring this important legislation.

As you know, the 103d Congress enacted the ban on so-called assault weapons and certain ammunition feeding devices by the narrowest of margins. The Gun Ban Repeal Act will undo that well-intentioned, but misguided, approach to combating gun violence in our society.

My legislation will delete from Public Law the provisions which outlaw the specified firearms and ammunition feeding devices. This bill will effect no other provision of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, and it will do nothing to hinder the ability of the House to enact new crime control legislation. The Act simply serves as the proper vehicle for the majority of the membership of the House—both Republicans and Democrats—to remove the most objectionable gun control measure enacted by the previous Congress.